



Text from documenta X - short guide

AYA & GAL have been working together for five years. They added the indicator "MIDDLE EAST" to their names, thus constituting a (political) label for their artistic activities. Their work develops through a material and conceptual process, for which they have coined the verb "to naturalize." As Ariella Azoulay remarks, "this hybrid term evokes the processes of becoming-citizen (naturalization) and becoming-interlinked (network), both of which happen on the surface and which they allegorize by the motif of skin. "They have created different latex skins which every future member of their project must wear to become a citizen, before being filmed in a short video segment where the participants engage in an everyday activity such as brushing their teeth, planting a tree, taking a picture, etc.

Their project for documenta is entitled The Naturalize/Local Observation Point (1996). It is an interactive installation including a CD Rom and a mural video projection. The CD Rom was created on the basis of a cartographic work built up around the YMCA building in Jerusalem, where the piece was shown for the first time. There, as Ariella Azoulay recalls the event, "a citizen-network, isolated from the surrounding physical world by a latex skin, drove a car with a video camera attached to the steering wheel. He took different paths which led nowhere, but which gradually enveloped the YMCA tower, or "Local Observation Point," like the threads of a spider web. The "Local Observation Point" (which also designates the spectator's position) lost sight of the citizen-network. In replacement of the panoramic view offered by the tower, the spectator is invited to navigate among the network of crisscrossing lines projected on the wall." To participate in the work of AYA & GAL MIDDLE EAST, one merely sits down on a sofa to circulate through this virtual space. Beyond the film's perimeter are two specific sites, located on roads leading to Dead Sea and the Jerusalem woods. These sites are defined by video showing two individuals in the process of "becoming-citizen"; one takes an open-air shower, the other plants a tree. The area covered by the film is a very sensitive zone of Jerusalem which includes the houses of the President and Prime Minister. The video allows the spectator to study all the possibilities for automobile traffic in the area, and thus to plan a possible escape.

The room where the piece is presented is tiled with a soft substance known as polyoriten. When the participant has finished with the computer and gets up off the sofa, she becomes conscious of the difference between the real place of installation where she is and the virtual space through which she has been navigating. A series of postcards showing twelve processes of "becoming-citizen" can be taken away for free. AYA & GAL MIDDLE EAST thus hope to send their images migrating through the international postal networks.

Paul Sztulman

The event was on 21.7.1997 Deucomenta halla Kassel

**Ariella Azoulay**

**Stories of hands (I)  
Becoming Naturalized in Jerusalem**

Ariella Azoulay

Jerusalem, as everyone knows, is a name of a city. But what is this city whose name is Jerusalem - that is a more difficult question. There is an earthly city whose name is Jerusalem, and there is also a heavenly one. There is a Jerusalem of stone and a Jerusalem of paper, a Jerusalem of iron and a Jerusalem of gold. There is a Christian, a Moslem and a Jewish Jerusalem. Evidently there is also Jerusalem as the capital of a Palestinian state, which is but a dream and a symbol of a national struggle, as well as Jerusalem as the capital of the State of Israel, which claims today to encompass all the other cities in one city "united forever". Israeli rule, which lays claim to having united the city has, in fact, created at least three more Jerusalems: the city of its citizens, the city of its permanent residents, who refuse or are not allowed to become Israeli citizens, and the city of its temporary and illegal residents, who are denied the right to become naturalized in their own city.

So many hands have a stake in the city; so many people and groups are fighting to lay their hands on the city, to manipulate its past and future, digging its ground to find new data to support these conflicting claims, reconstructing the evidence, and preparing themselves, and their city, for the Day of Judgment. Hands that intermingle with and interfere in the work of other hands, hands that build energetically and destroy, no less energetically, what others have built. Hands that draw maps, open some paths and close others, inscribe some dividing lines and erase others. Above all, hands that try to mold the city? s image and superimpose it on all others competing images.

The hectic work being done in Jerusalem is only partly overt, much of it is clandestine, concealed from the public eye. Some hands work gently, others are violent, but everyone seems very busy, and everything seems awfully urgent. Everything must be done before it? s too late; before further urban development takes place, or before too many Palestinians infiltrate into the city, or before more land is confiscated by the Israeli authorities, or before the peace talks resume, or before the next war, or before the Messiah comes. There may never be another chance to do whatever isn? t done today in this city, where time stretches to eternity and almost all this work is being done in the name of a past, always "our past," and for the sake of a certain future.

But what about the present? When everyone cares only for the past and only for the sake of a future, the present tends to disappear. When one ignores for a moment both the past and the future, this hectic urban scene I have just describe, is suddenly emptied of all national and religious narratives and transcendent subjects that animate them. One can see the city as a multiplicity of heterogeneous spaces and irreconcilable points of view. All one can see are those busy hands, those gentle and violent actions, those rapid, seemingly arbitrary changes in the city? s surface. No single narrative may have primacy over others, no single narrative may channel and direct the multiplicity of actions for the purpose of one preconceived or predetermined telos, a telos which seemingly lies outside the field of social action and endows it with meaning and justification.

These are our present - postmodern - conditions of knowledge and legitimation. Under these conditions, the modern separation between action and critical reflection is impossible. There is no ultimate foundation for any claim to know what needs to be done. In such a world, where the subject? s intentions and plans are constantly being undermined and aborted, the critical question- the question of (critical) art included - can no longer be "What has to be done?" The question is rather: "What the hell **can** be done?" or, "What, after all, can one do?" The

works of some artists who take part in the Documenta may be interpreted as attempts to raise this question and propose possible answers. I will briefly mention three of them and then take a closer look at one project, which will lead me back to the city of Jerusalem.

In the beginning of the eighties the Swedish artist Carl Michael von Hausswolf founded a new state named Elgland-Vergland. The new State's population numbers 300 citizens and is willing to let in and accommodate new immigrants. Elgland-Vergland is neither a modern Nation-State nor part of the tradition that criticizes it. It has adopted some of the main practices of a modern state, e.g., tax collection, issuing passports, membership in the UN (a formal request to join the organization was officially submitted recently). The state claims as its own territory the no-man's land stretching along borderlines between the states of the world, an area whose length is hundreds of thousands of kilometers and whose width is less than the width of a pencil's point. When citizen Van Hausswolf goes from one state to another he asks the policeman at the border control post to stamp his Elgland-Vergland passport in addition to his Swedish one. The stamped passport is an imaginary recognition of the real existence of his new state, or perhaps a real recognition of an imaginary state.

Another example: the Slovenian artist Marko Pelejan has constructed a media laboratory in which sophisticated communication and espionage equipment serves to intercept different types of messages transmitted in space, and to eavesdrop on different communication networks. And the last example: Aya & Gal, two Israeli artists who offer new procedures of becoming-citizen, of naturalization in networks of communication and interactions. Hence-Neturalization instead of naturalization. On the screens in this hall you can see "on live" how it works. Each of the projects I have mentioned makes use of concepts, practices, and instruments usually available to the secret services of sovereign states and other agencies of power: bugging, surveillance, territorial conquest, border control, techniques of identification and procedures of naturalization. Each of these projects challenge the limits of what can be done, pushes civil action to the limit, opens new routes of resistance to, and within, the social order. Yet each project operates without claiming to know what needs to be done and with no pretense at criticizing action from the outside.

The new strategy of critical intervention I have evoked here acknowledges its limited ability to impose a single point of view on the sphere of social action and does not pretend that its own visual field can be turned into a transparent field of social action. Therefore those who adopt this new strategy try to create an intermediate environment "inside" the networks of social interaction, knowing all too well that there is no place "out there". The new strategy - if strategy it is, indeed - presupposes the existence of an immanent tension between two elements that structure the field of social action: on the one hand, the position of the subject within a defined field of discourse and action that allows one to judge and act with a certain authority and claim to knowledge; on the other hand, the unavoidable intertwining of the subject's acts within conflicting networks of interaction that lie beyond his/her control, undermining his/her plans and intentions and constantly robbing his/her actions of their meaning.

With this tension in mind, let me come back to Jerusalem.

#### The Map of Jerusalem

In June 1967 the Israeli army crossed the armistice line, usually called the Green Line, between Jordan and Israel and conquered East Jerusalem (along with the rest of the West Bank). "Temple Mount is in my hands" shouted the commander of the conquering unit into his field radio coining an idiom that has become a symbol of the Israeli conquest. Before that date, the parties to the conflict recognized the Green Line as an international boundary only de-facto, but never de-jure. After June 1967 the unrecognized borderline was unilaterally erased by Israel and ever since then the whole city has been in Israeli hands, which alone have handled all its municipal affairs. Shortly after the war, in defiance of

international law, Israel annexed East Jerusalem along with other territories surrounding it. The Green Line was systematically erased from all official maps and gradually disappeared on the ground as a result of the massive urban development. = SLIDE - AERIAL PHOTO OF J = However, the Israeli attempt to present a unifying city never succeeded in erasing the real and imaginary line that still separates two hostile communities, two peoples, conquerors and conquered, who live worlds apart on either sides of the line.

At the basis of Israel's illegal policies in Jerusalem lie the faith that the Israeli state and its agents are at one and the same time an incarnation of a universal principle of transcendent subjectivity and the most powerful expression of one particular national subject. Israeli governments have acted and spoken as the sole legitimate representative of the Jewish people and its holy city. They have acted as if they believed that the world, history and their neighbors are but clay in the hands of the potter, the Israeli sovereign, that they can impose their will on reality and mold it singlehandedly to their own view. = SLIDE - NEW MAP OF J. = "Let there be no Green Line", they have declared, "let the city be united," and the divided city has become one.

Jerusalem thus becomes the arena for the manifestation of two aspects of subjectivity: on the one hand, the subject as an origin and an expression of mastery over others; on the other hand, subjectivity as self-mastery and self-determination. Presented from the perspective of this double subjectivity, the Green Line appears as a scar in the heart of the Holy City, and the city itself as an entity that has existed continuously, with no interruptions throughout 3,000 years of history. The city has sometimes been desolate, of course, in ruins, and 50 years ago it was divided, but there has always been one discrete entity, they claim, which has undergone destruction and division. The continuous conflict over the ownership of the city and its succession of masters and owners recede into the background. The unification of the city is not a decent political utopia that is meant to serve all parties involved. Its aim is not to build bridges between hostile nations and religions. It is rather a unilaterally metaphysical fantasy projected by Israelis onto thousands of years of the history of Jerusalem. But the city is harsh and stubborn; it does not respond in kind.

### The Green Line

In November 1948 Israel and Jordan signed an armistice agreement and drew the dividing line. Both parties considered the line in the nature of a temporary concession and hoped that the political reality which it created would soon change. At the talks, their representatives insisted on drawing the line with two different pencils. Abdallah El-Tal, the Jordanian, used a red pencil, while the Israeli, Moshe Dayan, used a green one. The map was of small scale (1:20,000) and the two lines together had a certain width, which meant in reality a long stretch of no-man's land, 60-70 meters wide and many kilometers long. = SLIDE - GREEN LINE/RED LINE =. Alongside these accidental no-man's land, there were other no-man's lands that were created intentionally, territories in regard to which the parties agreed not to agree, i.e., it was agreed to postpone the division. Thus the map of division actually reflects the reluctance of the two sides to come to terms with the division of the city. The two lines defined new areas of hostility and fighting.

### Permanent Residents

Following the occupation of East Jerusalem in 1967 and as an expression of its claim to sovereignty over the whole city, Israel annexed the occupied part and granted its 66,000 Palestinian inhabitants the status of permanent residents, giving them the option of becoming its citizens. They only had to swear allegiance to the Jewish State, the political incarnation of the Jewish national subject. Not surprisingly, very few Palestinians (no more than 2,000) have accepted this "generous" offer of a change of sovereignty and quick naturalization. As a result, by the very act of "unification," the city was again divided into classes of inhabitants. Most Palestinians are not citizens in their own

city. Their status of permanent residency was - and still is- conditional: Palestinians who leave the city for a long period of time for purposes other than education lose their right to live there. This right is conditional upon the Israeli law of immigration that grants them the status of permanent residents. Legally, they have become foreigners who immigrated to their own birthplace and their right to stay there is not automatically granted to their children. Thus the unified city is based on a system of nationalist apartheid in which the non-Jewish residents are systematically discriminated against in terms of rights, housing, urban and economic development, and education. ((Much effort is invested in maintaining or inventing the Jewish "character" of the city, especially in building new Jewish neighborhoods all around the eastern part of the city. Yet despite -or precisely because of - this new ring of Jewish neighborhoods, the city is all the more divided and the green line is still visible)).

#### The Hand that snips the Map

The ambivalence and indeterminacy of the Green Line that divided the city between 1948 and 1967 embodied the heterogeneity of the city and the fact that it inhabits simultaneously heterogeneous spaces and times which cannot be reduced to a single geopolitical space or contained in a single historical span. The conflict was inscribed onto the surface of the city and its resolution was visibly postponed. Direct confrontation between the hostile parties was deferred, allowing for a certain co-existence between conflicting fantasies and narratives. The different heterogeneous segments of which the city consists -national, religious and ethnic groups, forms of life, collective memories and collective dreams - were not forced into a hierarchical system and no primacy could have been granted to any of them. Such a hierarchical system was an inevitable consequence of the Israeli occupation and annexation of East Jerusalem and of the official, imposed unification of the city. The hierarchical system has been maintained within a fixed demographic framework. A special governmental committee for the development of Jerusalem found in 73 that the population ratio was 73.5% Israelis Jews to 25% Palestinians. and the official policy of all Israeli governments since has been to maintain this ratio by various means. Massive development of Jewish neighborhoods and Israel's legal administration of the city have created a continuous Jewish area in and around the city and have cut deeply into the Palestinian settled areas, shattering the Palestinian presence in and around the city into isolated fragments.

The Israeli occupation and administration of Jerusalem is based on a misleading ambiguity between representations (e.g., maps, statistical tables) and the represented objects (the urban space, population). On the one hand, the occupation regime uses the clean, objective language of scientific discourse, and assumes its distinction between objects and their representations. On the other hand, the same regime takes a very active part in the production of both the represented objects and their discursive representation, as if there were nothing to distinguish between them. When the data gathered "in the field" do not yield the desired map of Jerusalem, the map changes; when the reading of the map yields data that smack too much of apartheid, the data change. Jerusalem too, that most metaphysical of all cities, has witnessed the loss of the clear metaphysical distinction between the original and its simulacra, between territory and map, between the "thing itself" and its representation.

However, this is not a result of the fragmentation of the visual field and of the field of action or of the dissemination of the forces acting in Jerusalem. On the contrary, it is the result of Israel's domination and over-determination of those fields of vision and action. What seems for a moment as a postmodern practice of representation - a free and open market of identities, territories, maps, and narratives, a real fair of simulations - appears upon closer scrutiny to be the result of conscious manipulation of the data, the map and the territory, of rigid control of the different markets, and of massive intervention in the various practices of exchange. Israel administers the city to fit its desired map, and it draws the maps so as to fit its desired city. As a result 70,000 out of the 170,000 Palestinian permanent residents find themselves living in suburbs outside the official territory of Jerusalem, and they are gradually losing their status of

residency. =SLIDE E W J =.

### The Hand that snips Identity Cards

= SLIDE - BETZELEM COVER = . *Betzelm*, the Israeli organization for human rights in the occupied territories, published a report a few months ago on the "quiet deportation" of Palestinians from Jerusalem. The report contains dozens of testimonies, one of which I would like to present here. It is the story of Olga Mathri Chana Yoakim, aged 63, married and the mother of 7 children, some of whom have emigrated to the United States. She visited them a few years ago and stayed there for 18 months in order to receive special medical treatment. She recounts: "In September 1995 I went to the Ministry of The Interior in East Jerusalem in order to renew my old identity card. = SLIDE - MINISTER OF INTERIOR =. My husband came with me to do the same. His identity card was replaced on the spot. He was given a new card. Then the man at the desk took my card and snipped it with a pair of scissors. The man gave me a form to fill in - a request for a new identity card. He told me to come back in two weeks. When I came back they told me: You have no identity card, go to the West Bank. You cannot live in Jerusalem. They told me that if I want to come back to Jerusalem, I have to fill in a request for a family reunion. I did not do it. I am a resident of Jerusalem and I had an identity card that had to be renewed, that? s all." Miss. Yoakim has become an illegal resident in her own city.

This story deserves a closer look. It depicts a routine interaction between an individual and the representative of the state authorities that administer his or her life. The arbitrariness of this interaction is banal, the wickedness which it manifests is common. Bureaucratic power is exercised quietly: simple, unadorned offices, a few words, some files, and a pair of scissors. The scissors as an agent for carrying out a policy of apartheid.

The scissors do not act on their own. They are lying there, ready to hand, on the desk of a clerk, the last man in the chain of command that starts at the top, with the Minister of the Interior and his Prime Minister. The scissors are an instrument in the hands of the representative of state power. The clerk who represents the state is supposed to use his best judgment in order to carry out the policies of his superiors. But sometimes his hands act automatically. Using a pair of scissors may be such an automatic gesture. It is hard to tell what happened in the case of Mrs. Olga Mathri Chana Yoakim. Was it the long arm of the Israeli authorities that put the scissors to work in the name of the national subject? Or was it the bored hand of a careless clerk, who, as it happens was absentminded at the time, completely detached from the chain of command? Or maybe it was both at once, as the double language of the Israeli Supreme Court makes possible. I will quote here an exemplary piece of legal sophistry: "On the one hand, the license (of permanent residency) has a constitutive character, for it establishes the right of permanent residency; on the other hand, it is declarative, expressing the reality of permanent residency. When this reality disappears the license has nothing to support it and it is self-annulled."

### The Hand of the Citizen

It is time now to reflect on the hand of the citizen.

The hand, as everyone knows, is an important part of the body. It is an agent of action, an instrument for the realization of one? s will and intentions. The hand is not a free agent, of course, its activity is "in the hands" of the one whose hand it is, its master. Strong or weak, coarse or delicate, dexterous or clumsy; the hand is a unique manifestation of its master? s identity, personality, social status and manners, an expression of his or her inner nature. For two centuries at least, this same hand has also supposedly represented its master as a legal person, equal to others, and expressed his or her right to be represented as such. For more than two centuries, in Europe at least, this hand has reached out every once in a while to the voting booth and given expression to its master? s reason and free will, to his ability to make a reasonable decision (**his** ability first, the rich before the

poor, and only later **her** ability; the ladies came last). This is the hand of the citizen. In modern political systems voting has become the main instrument of political representation, and the citizen's hand has become the material seat of his or her political freedom. The voting citizen is a subject who gives expression - by means of a simple, handy gesture - to his/her inner, private will, thus turning it into a public voice. In assemblies as well as in voting booths, by raising one's hand, casting a vote in the ballot box or pushing a button, the hand expresses an inner will and a public opinion, taking part in the decision-making, in the process of collective self-determination, and in the formation of the general will. Together with the eye that sees and the mouth that speaks, the hand takes part in the interplay between interiorization and exteriorization, subjectivity and citizenship, freedom and equality.

Palestinian hands are not like this. Theirs do not represent their "owners," the persons to whom they belong, as legal persons equal to others, as citizens who have the right to be represented. At most, the Palestinian hand is an overt expression of the origin and identity of the one to whom it belongs. It is a means in the hands of the Israeli sovereign, who may use fingerprints for the purpose of identification and identity as the mark and cause of discrimination. Palestinians hands are not part of a space in which identities are determined according to what one does, but according to one's origin. In Jerusalem, a Palestinian hand may remain "within the law" if it is the hand of a manual worker who serves others, or it may transgress the law in protest and rebellion by throwing stones or molotov cocktails, brandishing posters, or drawing graffiti on walls.

But the hand, whether it belongs to a citizen or to an illegal resident, to a sovereign or to a subject (subjectus), does not simply belong to its master. The hand (and the same goes for the eye or the mouth, of course) is a mediating agent of actions whose origin and end lie far beyond the control of its master, the one who acts. The hand is an instrument for the realization of working-plans inscribed in the networks of interaction and communication and in other instruments of all kinds distributed around civic, geopolitical and virtual spaces. The hand is not a free agent and not the obedient agent of a free subject. It is controlled by different networks and various objects, continues their work, prolongs or extends them, and signals their presence. Whether skilled or in training, violent or delicate, acting or being acted upon, the hand is almost always a necessary organ of a certain instrument, an important switch in a network. When the modern citizen appeared a few centuries ago the hand was still a major organ for using force. Today most citizens, (western citizens) keep their hands near their pockets, manipulating buttons and plastic cards with them, moving timidly and politely among instruments in a very limited area, yet reaching very far indeed. With a slight move of a hand so many gates open wide, vast distances are bridged, and foreign worlds become accessible. Yet once inside the webs of techno-science and the networks of the mediamarket, that same mighty hand is interpellated, constrained, and manipulated by powers far beyond its control, obeying a logic we have not yet begun to understand. But one thing is clear: there are no subjects in this web, transcendent or otherwise, no sovereignty either. And at this point we may go back to Aya & Gal.

### The Naturalized

A few years ago Aya & Gal, two Israeli artists who live and work in Jerusalem, launched the project of the naturalization. For Aya & Gal, naturalization does not take place in a state, does not involve laws of immigration, and is not related to national identity. In their project, naturalization contradicts the conventional laws of naturalization in the modern nation-state. The procedure that baptizes one as a citizen in the nation-state, is first of all, a means of determining the identity and status of an individual and a certain relation between the individual and the political sovereign. For Aya & Gal naturalization means just the reverse. Naturalization is a process, not a procedure; it exists for the duration of this process, not striving to achieve any end. Alluding to Deleuze one may say that for Aya & Gal naturalization is an action of the order of **becoming**, not of the order of **being**, and it actually consists of active de-naturalization. Non pas etre citoyen mais devenir-citoyen. One intentionally becomes a stranger in known,



common situations, strips oneself of one's identity, or navigates one's way in purposefully strange, ready-made environments, in which one exercises a gradual accommodation. Aya & Gal's naturalization process deconstructs, or better dissolves, the unification and seeming coherency created when a certain dominating point of view - the point of view of the national subject, for example - is imposed on a heterogeneous reality. It is placed in-between different regimes of power and knowledge, partially escaping the control of each, exposing the bold stitches with which the dominating regime is trying to hold together a heterogeneous reality. Aya & Gal's project, I should add, is in no way a practical proposal, a politically conscious attempt to come to terms with the problem of naturalization in general or with the civic status of Palestinians in Jerusalem in particular. Nevertheless, it can be easily related to these problems, and to the specific problem-situation of Jerusalem, and it may be described as a possible answer to the question; In this city, at this time, what the hell can be done?. Speaking about their work, Aya & Gal said:

"Schematically, the citizen lives in two separate worlds. The act of naturalization puts him in a liminal position, which he could not hold in any other way. He becomes a naturalized citizen when he dons the suit. But it can be any form of separation, although separation isn't exactly the word. There is no attempt to disconnect him from this world, but neither is there any attempt to fix him in the other world he's being offered. The intention is to place him for a moment in a non-territorial position, it being unclear where the world begins and where it ends, and what his data are."



One day, the "naturalized citizen" of Aya & Gal got into an automobile. His body was encased in a layer of skin made of latex. He embarked on a drive around the YMCA tower in Jerusalem. SLIDE - YMCA DRIVE. The car rolled through the streets of some neighborhoods of West Jerusalem. (an area that has become the heart of the city after the "urban surgery" performed by Israel after 67). = SLIDE - MAP WITH REHAVYA =. The car was actually moving like a spider in the middle of its web. The YMCA tower enjoys a panoptic view of the city. It is an elevated, privileged point of view that may symbolize, in our story, Israeli domination of the city. = SLIDE YMCA = Only the Israeli authorities do not need today such an elevated point, for they are equipped with so many other instruments of surveillance and control (some of which I have mentioned above).



There was one naturalized-citizen sitting in the car that morning. = SLIDE - YMCA DRIVE=. He sat in the driver's place, a place intended for sovereign citizens trained by the state to drive through its streets, the place of a person worthy enough to navigate on its own, choose direction, have intention. But the place awaiting the citizen is the place of a missing accessory, the accessory that when connected to its place can propel the car and drive it properly. The state has forged this accessory - a free yet obedient citizen - in its factory but hasn't yet cast it inside the automobile. The automobile can set out on its way only after the citizen has sat in his place. Inside the car that toured Rehavya that morning sat a naturalized citizen. His sensory environment was dulled by the layer of latex and honed by the electronic eye that saw for him. A video camera that was attached to the steering wheel documented every turn, every stop. On sharp turns the naturalized citizen's legs were captured by the camera lens in an overview, looking down from the steering wheel. The video camera is the eye of the automobile, and the naturalized citizen with eyes in his head but with his head covered in latex, uses the camera as his own eye. This act of naturalization was the basis for the creating of an interactive map which has later become, in turn, an invitation to the spectators to become naturalized. The invitation is addressed to the one who uses the map. As the artists put it: "The naturalized citizen operates all intersections. When you watch a movie you watch somebody else doing something. When you touch the mouse it's as if you've shut the car door and driven off. You are inside the network, you and the network are one and the same thing, whoever comes to see becomes part of it, whether he wants to or not."

Aya & Gal projected the interactive map of Rehavya's streets in the YMCA tower, and it is now being projected here in Kassel. The spectator enters a sealed

space, he/she is invited to sit down, takes hold of the mouse and sets out on a journey of navigation. She/he is invited to become naturalized for a moment in the network of streets while driving by means of a mouse. The seeing car provides him/her with new fields of vision that do not allow whoever is driving at the moment to assume the position of a hypothetical detached spectator. The interactive map projected on the wall is the opposite of a territorial advantage (like the view from above) as a means of control over space. In this map, the overhead view from the tower is replaced by the systematic view of the photographed map which has been composed of hundreds of segments filmed by the video camera while driving through the city streets. = SLIDES: AYA AND GAL MAP + NYMBERS MAP = . "The project at the YMCA is another type of observation, say Aya & Gal. Let's assume that a spy takes the CD of the interactive map to Syria and wants to identify the escape routes from the prime minister's residence, located in this area. He can do it interactively. He can decide that he wants to drive left. You film a movie, scan the information, and the question is how you splice it and organize his navigational possibilities. From an innocent movie of the streets of Rehavya, such as any tourist could take, it can turn into top secret information. The way in which it's arranged turns it into an interactive map that had better not fall into the Syrians' hands; it's already in the same class as an aerial photograph."

The industrial revolution and later technological developments created new conditions for the hand's movements and activity, transforming the spatial relations within which it is entangled. Once an organ for carrying objects in space, the hand has become hooked to vehicles, an organ of transportation and commuting in real and virtual spaces. The hand has become capable of taking on acts and roles once associated solely with the leg, freeing the entire body for all kinds of new activities. Means of transportation have been improved to such an extent that the distance and time of traveling leave less and less of an impression on the body and mind of the travelers. However, our daily environment is populated with instruments ready to hand, especially designed to fit one's fingers, enhancing their movement to become ever more controlled and precise. Gadgets of all kinds interpellate the hand and call upon it to operate them, and through them to activate the entire systems to which they are hooked. The hand has become the servant of two masters: of the person in whose body it is an organ, and of the networks of interaction and communication to which it is hooked through all kind of instruments.

This double mastery over the hand means, in fact, the deconstruction of a single sovereign subjectivity, a liberation from the interiority of the subject, from the tyranny of the truth of the self. But in order to realize their interactive freedom, citizens must escape this regime of modern subjectivity in which the hand is often enlisted in order to illuminate the interiority of the individual, coax it and install it as the sole master of the body. Once liberated from the tyranny of the subject and the logic of subjectivity, citizenship turns into a habitual and continuous act of naturalization, a form of deviation from permanent citizenship, a kind of reverse naturalization: "Usually, say Aya & Gal, [the position of] the spectator [in art, in culture] has no interactive dimension. The spectators just see everything through their eyes. Seeing is completely detached from action. Whereis the naturalized citizen has an interactive dimension, but he is generally blind. The blindness stems from the fact that he is never sure in which space he is present. He is in a transient position. Neither here nor there".

In postmodern multiplied space every place "takes up place" in countless maps, pictures and networks, Every point in "real" space in principle becomes present in other spaces of at least two different types: the spaces in which it is represented (by means of photos maps etc.); the virtual spaces of interaction and communication that locate it alongside other points, connect it to them or separate it from them. Real or virtual, a place in a postmodern, multiple space is nothing more than a connection and crossover points from place to place.

The spaces of interaction and communication cannot be reduced to a given physical territory, they are not coterminous with any such territory, neither do they cancel it out. The industrial and technological revolutions that made these

changes possible have caused irreversible damage to the metaphysical conception of place as possessing value, essence, meaning and a peculiarity of its own. I would like to suggest that the French Revolution balanced the damage to the metaphysics of place to a certain degree by inventing the citizen. The citizen is an address? and an intersection? in the virtual space of the Republic, into which all the other spaces are supposed to devolve. If the citizen is an address, Man is the one who lives at this address. The Man inside the citizen ensures? according to the metaphysics of the sovereign subject and ist modern state? that the address will not remain a virtual address. Man ensures the metaphysical rights of the citizen: to be the possessor of an essence, value and peculiarity, to be the origin of acts of interaction and communication, to be the source of their meaning and value. The invention of the citizen was in fact, the invention of a new place? the human being. The citizen described in the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen* was depicted as someone who is supposed to defend the human being, his natural rights and his liberty by means of membership in a sovereign political community. For ist part, the humanity of Man provides the citizen with an anchor for his universal pretension, the pretension to posses rights and experiences that precede the political order and which cannot be abrogated by it. The Man that found expression in the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen* is a "natural" human being, whose body is his own property, who has a right to his body. He is endowed not only with freedom of movement and speech, but also with freedom to operate the instruments at his disposal. Right ascribes concrete acts and alienable objects to inalienable transcendant subject. Hence the person who dwells in this body and operates these instruments conceives of them as alien, subject to his or her authority. The freedom to operate and the desire to make use merge into the regime of a subjectivity that is beyond the world of appearances.

The concept of Man mediates between the citizen as an address in virtual space and the individual, concrete place in real space. The citizen? s possessions? the body being his real estate? are a real place that in principle cannot be appropriated. The assets can be replaced in accordance with market conditions, and thus the body is left as the fixed residence of the sovereign citizen. This place and the space in which it is planted compete with the virtual space in which the citizen is only an address, an intersection, and a crossover point. There are at least two orders of space involved here. A growing colonization movement of the individual and of the world takes place in both. Both are characterized by a claim to totality. Each has a tendency to deny or ignore the other space. The entire world turns into a heterotopic space.

In a short text entitled "Of Other Spaces" Michel Foucault presents his concept of "heterotopy"(heteros-topos, other place/space). Heterotopy for Foucault is a social site designed for human activity, well demarcated, both spatially and temporally. It is characterized by a double logic of social space and the simultaneous coexistence of two or more spatial settings. Foucault mentions a few examples: the museum, the cemetery, the holiday village. These examples prevent one from fully realizing the power of the heterotopic idea. For in the heterotopic site, spaces may be multiplied, not only doubled, and the simultaneous presence of the individual in these different spaces may be multiplied as well -e.g. the individual as a citizen in civic space, an address in virtual space, an outlet in a network, a body in a physical environment, etc. Heterotopy, I would like to argue, concerns the users of a site, not only its spatial organization. Moreover, today heterotopy is not just a matter of well-demarcated sites. The whole world, or at least large portions of it, have become heterotopic. If the world is heterotopic, or if being-in-space means being-in-heterotopic-space, going into and out of "other" spaces is a matter of making and unmaking contacts, hooking or unhooking appliances, being in touch with someone, being exposed to the gaze of someone, being in reach of something. When this is the nature of our most basic spatial condition, the spatial inscription of socio-political demarcations, boundaries and borders cannot be presented any longer in terms of territory and territorialization, at the very least not only in these terms. The individual too cannot be "contained" within the space occupied by his or her body. The limited space of one? s body is multiplied in these "other spaces," it is represented or has correlates in those spaces. But all these spaces are always

somehow "out of joint" - there is no exact overlapping, there is no one set of spatial coordinates that contains them all. All these other spaces are populated with persons, bodies, objects, instruments and appliances, they are interwoven in different, partly intersecting and partly unrelated networks of speech, vision, and interaction. And in the constant shifts and transitions among these spaces the hand provides the ticket, the license, the right of passage; it serves as a gatekeeper and a bridge, it crosses and builds distances; in short, it allows space to become spatialized. This hand, however, belongs neither to the sovereign citizen nor to the instrument that is supposed to serve him or her. This is the hand of the naturalized citizen, the one who becomes a citizen of liminal zones, of intermediate spaces, a citizen of passages, a citizen in passing, i.e., one who is always in the process of becoming a citizen.

The examples provided by Foucault in order to illuminate the concept of heterotopy restrict the concept to the point of view of sovereign subjects who define the rules of the game in heterotopic sites. Aya and Gal's naturalization project makes it possible to reinterpret the concept of heterotopy in a way that distances it from the examples provided by Foucault but somehow maybe returns it closer to the logic of the concept. There is no heterogeneity of time and space if the human being still remains their sovereign, and if he or she is maintained as a coherent entity that occupies a homogeneous territory. The heterotopic dimension of the world is a daily occurrence that takes place at surface level, in the abrasive meeting between spaces, in the small gaps in-between, in new configurations. Heterotopic naturalization is naturalization in no place at all, in other words, it takes place on the boundary between places. It is an act of individuals that only seldom exceeds the boundaries of private action, to take place entirely in that undefined space that is open in principle to everyone and in which each individual is nothing but an address. This act of Aya & Gal is another attempt? perhaps as hopeless as its predecessors? to escape homogenizing and arbitrary networks of exchange and communication without falling into the closed world of the subject and the spaces managed by the State and its apparatuses.

I am not trying to suggest that the world of techno-science with its virtual spaces, random events and inevitable catastrophes is necessarily better than the modern world in which identities are fixed and pinned down to nationalities and territories. I would agree neither to the meta-narrative implied by such a suggestion nor to its either-or logic. I have assumed that the postmodern resident of other spaces is always already here and there, involved in and identified with both this and that, and that a unified coherent world has been lost forever. Always serving two masters or more, he or she may at best navigate his/her way between the different spaces, resisting all temptation to stick to the one and disregard the other(s), trying, as much as he or she can, to keep moving in between.

And Jerusalem? Jerusalem should be de-naturalized. One should let it be what it really is: a complex of irreconcilable other spaces, a real heterotopy. One should free it from the hold of this or that transcendent, national subject. The sacredness of the city must turn into one more value of exchange in its many heterogeneous economies, a code for one more map of sites and itineraries. The condition for all this is, of course, the termination of the Israeli occupation and the granting of citizenship to its Palestinian residents. This citizenship may be Palestinian, assuming that a sovereign Palestinian state emerges, or Israeli, assuming that Israel becomes the state of all its citizens, Arabs no less than Jews. Utopian as these two political solutions may sound, they still do not mean emancipation or redemption, for there will always remain those other spaces in which one's hand is so constantly busy serving anonymous masters, entangled in opaque networks no one will ever control.